

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	§	
	§	
VS.	§	NO. 3-09-CR-0016-M
	§	NO. 3-12-CV-0798-M
MARCUS MOTTON	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE, AND
DENYING A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

The United States Magistrate Judge made Findings, Conclusions and a Recommendation in this case. An objection was filed by the defendant on June 11, 2012. The District Court reviewed *de novo* those portions of the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation to which objection was made, and reviewed the remaining proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation for plain error. The Court notes that the defendant did not address the difference between Texas Transportation Code §§ 503.062(c) and 503.063 nor the key issue of the officer's reasonable suspicion to conduct the initial traffic stop. Finding no error, the Court ACCEPTS the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge.


Considering the record in this case and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b), Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 proceedings, and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), the Court DENIES a certificate of appealability. The Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation filed in this case in support of its finding that the defendant has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) that reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right" and

“debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).¹

In the event the defendant will file a notice of appeal, the court notes that

- () the defendant will proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal.
- (X) the defendant will need to pay the \$455.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

SO ORDERED this 6th day of July, 2012.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Barbara M. G. Lynn", is written over a horizontal line.

BARBARA M. G. LYNN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

¹ Rule 11 of the Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 Cases, as amended effective on December 1, 2009, reads as follows:

(a) Certificate of Appealability. The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant. Before entering the final order, the court may direct the parties to submit arguments on whether a certificate should issue. If the court issues a certificate, the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the court denies a certificate, the parties may not appeal the denial but may seek a certificate from the court of appeals under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22. A motion to reconsider a denial does not extend the time to appeal.

(b) Time to Appeal. Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a) governs the time to appeal an order entered under these rules. A timely notice of appeal must be filed even if the district court issues a certificate of appealability.